

Preamble

The late, great A.K. Chesterton wrote once that the "CRITICISM of the Jews, as distinct from the criticism of any other race, is an activity which creates such a highly-charged emotional atmosphere that it should be undertaken only by critics who have an interest in distinguishing between truth and falsehood. Mr. Eustace Mullins, unfortunately, seems to lack this most desirable qualification." (1) Like Chesterton, the current writer is no Jewish apologist, (2) and like Chesterton I have the scars to prove it, having been both smeared from pillar to post as an anti-Semite by the slime of Organised Jewry, libelled by a disgusting "Jewish" newspaper and an even more disgusting "Jewish" race-hate magazine, and battered with mallets on my own doorstep by goy thugs who had obviously been hired to attack me by the sweepings of the ghetto. Also, like Chesterton, I am not so stupid as to fail to distinguish between "the Jews" and the political gangsters who hide behind the name Jew; nor am I so stupid as to enthusiastically endorse every anti-Semitic calumny which comes through my letter box on the grounds that if one throws enough dirt at the Chosen Race, some of it will stick. These are in fact the tactics adopted by the proponents of political Zionism for the past half century and more, and personally I like to think that I am better than they are, even if only by virtue of the fact that I would find it physically impossible to stoop so low.

Unfortunately, some people who take on the power of the Zionist octopus become infected, sooner or later, with the poison they profess to be combating. One of these people, whom I will charitably concede has been infected later rather than sooner, is Michael A. Hoffman II. With a surname like Hoffman, some people might reckon that the man was himself one of the Chosen, and, in view of his anti-Semitic proselytising, is perhaps eaten up with self-hatred. I am informed though that Mr Hoffman is in fact half-German and half-Italian as well as all-American. His ethnic origins aside, while some of the research he publishes is undoubtedly excellent, both his powers of reasoning and his sense of humour leave much to be desired. Permit me to explain.

In 1985, Mr Hoffman covered the show trial in Toronto, Canada, of earnest Ernst Zundel. As a result of that he wrote a book which was published that same year by that much maligned beacon of light in the Zionist-perpetuated darkness, the Institute for Historical Review. This book, *The Great Holocaust Trial*, is, admittedly, as much polemical as it is factual, and it is written in places in a whimsical style which is perhaps not entirely fitting in a serious work of historical revisionism, and one covering legal proceedings at that. Although some might argue that anyone who has seen the spectacle of Raul Hilberg backtracking on the Holocaust in the witness box, and seen a damned liar like Auschwitz survivor Rudolph Vrba exposed for the fraud he is, is entitled to inject a little humour into his narrative.

That notwithstanding, since the publication of Hoffman's book the world has witnessed another Zundel trial, at which the prosecution didn't dare put *survivors* in the witness box a second time, and in which, indeed, the Jewish survivor and Holocaust Revisionist (the late) J.G. Burg appeared for the defence! The world has also witnessed the spectacle of the four million Jews allegedly exterminated at Auschwitz rounded down quietly to a million and a half. (3) And the other two and a half million being relocated even more quietly elsewhere!

In other words, the forces of darkness are on the run, and it is only their stranglehold over our news and entertainments media, the never-ending wailing and gnashing of teeth about the evils of "anti-Semitism", and the odd swastika daubed on a synagogue wall (courtesy of the JDL), that keeps the broader public from waking up to the prosaic truth that they've been conned.

One would have thought then that the hatemongering, the absurd conspiracy theories and the pseudo-intellectual abuse could be left to those wonderful people who gave you Sabra and Shatila. After all, they're doing a better job than the Revisionists, a better job than Dr Goebbels, some might say. Unfortunately, Mike Hoffman is not content with churning out factually accurate reports on the distortions of history by the Hollywood pooh bahs, the ADL and their goy fellow travellers in the Socialist International, he has to not only demonise the benign if boring religion of Orthodox Judaism, but shift the whole blame for Zionist mendacity onto the *Torah*.

If Hoffman were a gullible old woman like the now twice convicted "anti-Semite" Lady Birdwood, that would be excusable. If he were a former Tsarist agent and con man à la Boris Brasol, peddling the *Protocols Of Zion* and other nonsense to an American Flivver King with more money than sense, that would be understandable (though deplorable). But Mike Hoffman is neither of these things, rather he is a serious researcher with some pretence to academia. Certainly he appears to know something about the *Torah*, as evinced by the angry letter he sent me in reply to my missive which pointed out the error of his ways. Mike Hoffman's rantings and ravings are therefore totally inexcusable.

What though are his ravings? Having wittered on for nine hundred words, I haven't even indicated to you dear reader what they are. Okay, let's waste no further time. Turn to pages 12-5 and you will see for yourself *the* prime example. These pages reproduce in full a leaflet entitled *The Talmud Judaism's Holiest Book Documented and Exposed*. (4) Incidentally, I haven't obtained permission from Hoffman to reproduce this leaflet so I am in breach of copyright. Sue me, asshole.

According to Mr Hoffman, the *Talmud* is the root of all evil. Don't take my word for it, you have it there in black and white. Unfortunately for Hoffman though, this leaflet is not a mere distortion, with words and phrases torn out of context, he has in places resorted to outright fraud, fabricating the texts of the Jews' holiest (though admittedly extremely turgid) book. How do I know? Because in 1992, I did what Hoffman has obviously done but doesn't expect his dumb *goy* readers to do, I pried into the *Talmud* with a little assistance from an Orthodox Rabbi, (5) who also told me a few home truths about those wonderful people who gave you Sabra and Shatila. (6) Okay, let's waste no further time in polite introductions, and get straight on with the task at hand, exposing Hoffman's major calumny.

Mike Hoffman's "The Talmud Judaism's Holiest Book Documented and Exposed" Documented And Exposed!

Page H1: Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik died April 8, 1993, yet Hoffman's leaflet speaks of him as though he is still living. Clearly this is not a mistake on his part because the *New York Times* report he quotes from on page H2 is obviously the Rabbi's obituary. According to the obituary published in the *London Times*, April 21, Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, who lived to the ripe old age of 90, was both the son of a rabbi and the father of one. He is indeed estimated to have ordained over 2,000 rabbis over more than four decades. It is not clear to me whether or not this represents an entire generation, as Hoffman claims, but it is certainly impressive, and he was clearly a man of enormous influence. He was an outstanding Talmudic and secular scholar. However, the claim that he was the "unchallenged leader" of Orthodox Judaism does not ring quite true, whether or not this opinion belongs to Hoffman, the *New York Times* correspondent or to anyone else.

According to my source, (7) Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik was something of a reformist. Obviously he was also something of a Zionist, because he once advised Israel to give up the West Bank because "...he thought its retention was not worth putting lives at risk..." (8) Incidentally, *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* 1992 refers to him as Joseph Ber Soloveichik [note the spelling] rather than Joseph D. Soloveitchik as given by Hoffman. The then still extant Rabbi was referred to therein as a "US rabbinic scholar. Head of the R. Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary at Yeshiva University..." (9)

Back to Mike Hoffman. On pages H2 and H3, he claims "Every selection we cite is documented directly from the text of the authoritative Soncino Talmud. (10) We have published herein the authenticated sayings of the Jewish Talmud." Then he adds "Look them up for yourself." You'll be sorry you said that, Mike.

Let me state here that I don't intend to refute every single calumny reproduced (or fabricated) in this leaflet, but I tackle enough for the reader to make up his own mind about the veracity and motives of our erstwhile Revisionist turned latter day Streicher.

Okay, here we go: page H3. Hoffman begins here in earnest with the claim that "The translators of the Talmud sometimes translate the word *goyim* (Gentiles) under any number of terms such as heathen, Cuthean, Egyptian, idolater etc. But these are actually references to Gentiles (all non-Jews)." To add an air of authenticity to this nonsense, Hoffman remarks "See for example footnote 5 on p. 361 and footnote 5 on p. 388 of the Soncino edition Talmud: 'Cuthean (Samaritan) was here substituted for the original *goy*...'"

Let's start with that word *goyim*. Although it is used to designate all non-Jews, and may also be used pejoratively, (11) it doesn't actually mean Gentiles at all. And it certainly doesn't mean heathens or cattle as Hoffman's fellow travellers often make out. The literal translation of the word *goyim* is *nations*. In biblical usage, the word *goy* can be used to designate Israel; it also came to mean "the pagan world", while in Poland it came to mean "ignorant peasant". (12)

Likewise the word *shiksah* (meaning a *goy* bitch) is actually derived from the Hebrew word *sheketz* meaning abomination, supposedly a humorous exaggeration. (13) (But don't say that until you've met my wife). On the subject of Gentiles of either sex, the *UJE* points out that Indian Moslems and Mormons also refer to outsiders as Gentiles. (14)

Nor does the word "heathen" mean simply any non-Jew. The *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* points out that the term heathen is actually of Christian origin and refers to pagans who practised such things as child sacrifice, sexual licence and cruel games. (15) There was a very strong taboo amongst the ancient Israelites against falling into idolatry, though why they or anyone else should believe that worshipping one God is so superior to worshipping several, or idols, remains to be seen.

Clearly the words Cuthean and Egyptian mean precisely that: Cuthean and Egyptian; idolaters (idol worshippers, worshippers of stars and planets, (16) etc) mean exactly that, ie they're damned heathens.

Finally, something that should warm the cockles of Hoffman's heart (if he has one). The anti-Zionist Jew Lenni Brenner is one of the most outspoken critics of this cancerous ideology, although for very different reasons from Hoffman. In one of his studies of Zionism he unearths such niceties as: "The fact is undeniable that the Jews collectively are unhealthy and neurotic. Those professional Jews who, wounded to the quick, indignantly deny this truth are the greatest enemies of their race..."

And "parasites, people fundamentally useless."

And "not a nation, not a people, not human."

Just the sort of comment Hoffman would doubtless agree with. Except that all these quotes are attributed by Brenner to Zionist Jews! (17) Again, this shows both how important it is not to tear words out of context and how easy it is to distort even the most innocuous of banter.

On page H3, Hoffman tells us that "If a Jew is tempted to do evil he should go to a city where he is not known and do the evil there." The text Hoffman cites for this, *Mo'ed Katan* 17a, page 107, actually says: "...R. Il'ai says, If one sees that his [evil] yezer is gaining sway over him, let him go away where he is not known; put on sordid clothes, don a sordid wrap and do the sordid deed that his heart desires rather than profane the name of Heaven openly."

My understanding of this - from an interview with a Rabbi - is that the *evil* referred to is a bit of nookie. The proper interpretation of this passage is that good Jews don't fornicate. However, if you really can't help yourself and you feel that you must avail yourself of the services of a harlot, don't shit on your own doorstep. Take yourself away to somewhere you are not known and have your end away there. (18)

Also on page H3, Hoffman tells us that the reference in *Baba Mezia* 114a-114b "Only Jews are human ('Only ye are designated *men*') is a literal interpretation. This is a well worn distortion. It is sometimes rendered "Jews are human beings; the other peoples of the world are not human beings but beasts."

In fact, as long ago as 1941, the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* had the measure of this nonsense, but let us see what the *Talmud* actually says: "R. Simeon b. Yohai said: The graves of Gentiles do not defile, for it is written, *And ye my flock, the flock of my pastures, are men; 6 only ye are designated 'men'.*" 7"

[The 6 and 7 in the above text refer to footnotes; footnote 7 says of this "Only, of course, from the point of view of ritual defilement." For the record, I have generally omitted such notes in this text for clarity.]

And, according to Hoffman: *Sanhedrin* 58b. (p. 398). "If a heathen (Gentile) hits a Jew, the Gentile must be killed. Hitting a Jew is the same as hitting God."

He's talking about Gentiles again; the *Talmud* talks about heathens, hence: "R. Hanina said: If a heathen smites a Jew, he is worthy of death..." is the actual quote. In reality, this refers to Moses slaying an Egyptian who had struck an Israelite.

Next, Hoffman tells us that *Baba Kamma* 37b, page 211, is rendered thus: "If an ox of an Israelite gores an ox of a Canaanite there is no liability; but if an ox of a Canaanite gores an ox of an Israelite...the payment is to be in full." On page H4, he supplements this with an outright calumny, *Baba Kamma* 37b, page 213: "Gentiles are outside the protection of the law and 'God has 'exposed their money to Israel.'" Naughty, naughty. The actual passage contains no reference to Gentiles at all. What it does say is this: "...He rose up and declared them to be outside the protection of the civil law of Israel [with reference to damage done to cattle by cattle]." There is a note here, "The exemption from the protection of the civil law of Israel thus referred only to the Canaanites and their like who had wilfully rejected the elementary and basic principles of civilised humanity."

And "As Canaanites did not recognise the laws of social justice, they did not impose any liability for damage done by cattle. They could consequently not claim to be protected by a law they neither recognised nor respected..." [*Baba Mezia* 14a-b, pages 213 & 211 respectively.]

This was actually part of an ongoing dispute between the Israelites and the Canaanites. See, no reference to Gentiles or to money. Score seven points out of a possible five hundred and write out one hundred times "I will tell the truth in future and will leave both lying and racial hatred to the proponents of political Zionism."

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

The *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* has an entry for *CANAAN* (Volume 2, page 651). This says of the Canaanites that they were the enemies of the Israelites and were gradually exterminated or absorbed by the Israelite tribes and were - in any case - of Semitic stock. So as Mike Hoffman is one of those people who likes to make much of the term "Semites", any which way you look at it, this was not a pronouncement against the wicked *goyim* but against one of their own ilk. (Though he can take some comfort from the admission that the Chosen Race also practised extermination, which does make their incessant whining and wailing about it today more than a little hypocritical).

On page H4, Hoffman tells us that, according to *Baba Mezia* 24a, page 151: "If a Jew find an object lost by a Gentile ('heathen') it does not have to be returned." More garbage. This is a total distortion; there is no mention of Gentiles. This passage is concerned with what one should do when one finds money. For example, in a place where crowds are frequent, should one announce this? One can imagine the practical problem here. "Hey guys, I've just found a wallet; there's no ID in it but it does contain a hundred shekels. Will the owner take one step forward?" And Isaac gets trampled to death. I remember something like this happening to myself; a few years ago I found a ten pound note in the street. (19) If I'd found a thousand pounds or a valuable necklace then I should by rights have handed it in, (20) but a tenner is finders keepers. It is quite likely that the person who dropped it didn't realise, and it is extremely unlikely that the loss, if noticed, was reported to the police station. (21)

Page H6: Citing tractate *Menahoth* 43b-44a, page 264, Hoffman says: "A Jewish man is obligated to say the following prayer every day: Thank you God for not making me a Gentile, a woman or a slave." (The quotes are mine; as with most of his distortions it is not clear whether or not Hoffman is [allegedly] quoting verbatim). Exactly what is this quote supposed to prove? It is better to be a man than a woman? It is better to be a free man than a slave? Considering the *male chauvinism* of all tribes in this era, the first hardly reflects detrimentally on the Jews, or indeed on anyone. And surely it is better not to be born a slave whatever one's race or sex. And of course, slavery was universal in those days, and indeed is still practised in certain countries today.

The following are actually the verbatim passages: "It was taught: R. Meir used to say, A man is bound to say one hundred blessings daily, as it is written, *And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee?*" (pages 263-4).

And page 264: "It was taught: R. Judah used to say, A man is bound to say the following three blessings daily: '[Blessed art thou...] who hast not made me a heathen; '...who hast not made me a woman'; and '...who hast not made me a brutish man...' One authority said he should substitute '...who hast not made me a slave'." We are told also that "A slave is more contemptible [than a woman]". Clearly, this refers to the status of a slave and the status of a woman.

Page H4: *Abodah Zarah* 22a-22b, pages 113-4. "Gentiles prefer sex with cows." Naughty, naughty. The word Gentile doesn't appear anywhere here. What the *Talmud* does say in *Abodah Zarah* 22b, is as follows: "MISHNAH: ONE SHOULD NOT PLACE CATTLE IN HEATHENS' INNS, BECAUSE THEY ARE SUSPECTED OF IMMORAL PRACTICE WITH THEM..."

There is a footnote here on the ill-repute of Greek and Roman inns. But no mention of Welsh farmers, sheep or Wellington boots. Nor of Essex girls.

Hoffman, page H4: *Abodah Zarah* 36b, page 176 is cited thus: "Gentile girls are in a state of *niddah* (filth) from birth."

Of course, if all Jews, blacks and other non-whites believed that of whites, there would be none of that awful miscegenation, something which clearly bothers Mr Hoffman, and which he appears from his other writings to hold the Jews solely responsible for the promotion of. (22) So why is he complaining?

There is actually a tractate called *Niddah*; it runs to 500+ pages with a glossary. The *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* also has an entry for *NIDDAH* (Volume 8, page 217). Here it is translated literally as "menstruous woman". The *UJE* comments that "Biblical law provided that a woman in menstruation should be regarded as ritually unclean for a period of seven days..."

In other words there is filth and there is filth. *Niddah* is a state of spiritual uncleanness, not in the same sense as for example a necrophiliac or a cannibal is spiritually unclean, but unclean in the sense of "Keep your filthy hands off that young girl's snatch, you lecherous old Yid" type unclean. It actually says here that "[The Schools of Hillel and Shammai] decreed that their daughters should be considered as in the state of *niddah* from their cradle..." And a footnote says "They would then defile by touch". [This is from *Abodah Zarah*, page 176.]

A word of explanation is necessary for those unfamiliar with Talmudic logic. The *Talmud* is like absolutely no other book, and it leaves absolutely nothing to chance. Anyone who has ever issued a libel writ will realise just how precisely each and every point must be pleaded on peril of being struck out by the court as showing no cause of action. Likewise, the authors of the *Talmud* wanted to make sure that the pious Jew knew exactly what to do and what not to do in exactly every instance. The bit about "defiling by touch" concerns such matters as the age

of consent. Let us draw a contemporary parallel. In 1993, two young boys in Liverpool, England, were convicted of murdering a two year old boy, Jamie Bulger. (23) At the time this terrible crime was committed, they were both ten years old. But what if they'd been eight years old, or six? It is certainly not impossible that a very young child could wilfully injure or even kill a baby. Could a six year old be tried for murder? (24)

As things stand, a boy of fourteen can be charged with rape because the law presumes that a boy of thirteen or younger cannot commit rape. Obviously this is an arbitrary cut-off point because not every boy becomes capable of getting a hard-on on his fourteenth birthday. So with the *defilement* of very young girls. For example *Sanhedrin*, 55b, (page 371), reports that "...Pederasty with a child below three years is not treated as with a child above that." Such interminable (and mind-numbingly boring) discussions are all part of this debate, and there is no inference or suggestion that pederasty is ever acceptable with a child, or indeed under any circumstances at all, the ravings of Hoffman and his fellow travellers aside.

In some Islamic countries to this day - I am led to believe - if a woman is raped, she becomes defiled. Curiously, the *shame* is hers and not her rapist's. She is then - get this - supposed to marry her rapist! (25) But what if she is below a certain age? Hopefully they'll chop the bastard's balls off, but does the girl become defiled? If she is very young when she is abused, is she still treated in law as though she were a virgin?

Such instances are of course exceedingly rare in all cultures, but like I said, the *Talmud* leaves absolutely nothing to chance. And such passages are often twisted by anti-Semites - or in Hoffman's case, the mentally deranged - so as to appear to claim that *Torah*-true Jews are closet paedophiles. Hoffman gets in on the act on page H5 when he appears to quote from *Sanhedrin* 54b, page 371, thus: "A Jew may have sex with a child as long as the child is less than nine years old" And with *Kethuboth* 11b, page 58: "When a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl it is nothing." Again, these are well known calumnies which have been going the rounds since before he was born, but the man does not lack originality, he has invented some entirely new ones of his own.

More garbage, the *Sanhedrin* 54b quote refers to the age of consent: "if one committed sodomy with a child of a lesser age, no guilt is incurred." [Ie less than 9 years old.]

For the record, when I took Rabbi Goldstein to meet Lady Birdwood, she was mildly insulted that he would not shake hands with her. (26) "We don't shake hands with ladies" he politely told another of my elderly lady friends. He told me sometime later that he wouldn't touch any woman physically except his wife, sister, daughter, etc. Obviously for younger girls (and boys) this is not practical, so there must be some sort of cut off point at which a child has no sexuality in Jewish law as in the law of every civilised land, which, at a push, includes Israel. This is what the *Talmud's* passages on children and sex are concerned with, not in justifying or promoting paedophilia.

We come now to Hoffmanesque calumnies for which the current writer provides not just documentary but photographic proof. On pages 16-9, the reader will find reproduced photocopies of actual pages from the Soncino *Talmud*. We'll deal first with Hoffman's claim on pages H6 and H7 concerning stolen wine, something he obviously knows a lot about; he has certainly stolen the whine of those wonderful people who gave you Sabra and Shatila, (or is at best doing his damndest to imitate them).

Hoffman's implication is that this passage permits the drinking of stolen wine, ie that the rabbi is encouraging theft. The key to this is the word *permit*; here it means, clearly, permissible for a Jew. Look also at the footnotes (pages 16-7 in this pamphlet, 336 of *Abodah Zarah*), always vitally important when reading anything from the *Talmud*, it states clearly at the bottom of page 336 that some rabbis oppose Rabbi Eliezer. This is hardly surprising because the *Talmud* is actually one continuous, boring discourse on what is permitted, what is not, what Rabbi A said, Rabbi B's comment on it, Rabbi C's appraisal of that, and so on. The very last thing the rabbi here, or any rabbi, is interested in, is drinking stolen wine, rather on the consequences for all concerned and the ramifications in this world and the next.

For example, on page H6, Hoffman claims that the minor tractate *Hagigah* informs us that "no rabbi can ever go to hell". (27) I was once told by an Orthodox Rabbi that he would go to Hell if he ate a bacon sandwich. We will return to Hell shortly, but in the meantime, let's return to our scrutiny of Hoffmanesque calumny re the *Talmud* proper.

On page H5, Hoffman fabricates the following quote: "A woman who had intercourse with a beast is eligible to marry a Jewish priest. A woman who has sex with a demon is also eligible to marry a Jewish priest."

The astute reader will notice that this forged quote begins with quotation marks but ends without them. Doubtless so that if some dumb goy were to happen upon it, Mr Hoffman could claim that he wasn't really quoting verbatim - he sure as Hell wasn't - and that the first quote marks were a mere slip of the pen. (Or whatever wordprocessor he's using, WordImperfect version 6,000,000 perhaps?) Anyway, enough of my witless wit; compare the word according to Mike Hoffman with the word according to Mr Soncino, (page 18 in this pamphlet). With a disrespect for truth that would honour Gerry Gable himself, Hoffman has fabricated the reference to the demon. Or perhaps

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

it's elsewhere, I've no doubt there are as many demons in the *Talmud* as in Michael Hoffman's head, but it sure ain't on page 397 of *Yebamoth*. The reference to "no human being" clearly refers to "A beast", (footnote 5). Note too Hoffman's persistent use of the word Jewish. They weren't Jews, they were Israelites, remember Mike? Tch, tch, tch. Is he trying to tell us something, one wonders? Incidentally, the quote lower down the page *Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot, or the price of a dog*, has, to my certain knowledge, been perverted by Hoffman's fellow travellers on at least one occasion. Robert Singerman's *ANTISEMITIC PROPAGANDA: An Annotated Bibliography and Research Guide*, lists a publication by Thomas E. O'Brien of the so-called New Christian Crusade Church. Here it becomes "The temple can accept money given by a man to a harlot to associate with his dog." (Sotah 26b).

On page H6, Hoffman quotes from *Pesahim* 111a, page 571. "It is forbidden for dogs, women or palm trees to pass between two men, nor may others walk between dogs, women or palm trees. Special dangers are involved if the women are menstruating or sitting at a crossroads."

This is not a verbatim quote - as the reader will see from the actual text on page 19, but for once it has not been distorted. However, it hardly qualifies as *Sick and Insane Teachings*, the sub-heading on page H5. What it does qualify as is nonsense, old wives' tales.

However, Hoffman is back to his old habits further down the page with a quote from page 409 of *Shabbath*. The actual quote is: "The Israelites are holy, and do not cohabit by day! - But Raba said: If the house is in darkness, it is permitted. Raba also said - others state, R. Papa: A scholar may cause darkness with his garment, and it is [then] permitted." Is this really so terrible? "Isaac, can't we do it with the lights on just this once?"

"Have you no shame, woman? Now get down on your knees. And pray!"

On page H4, *Abodah Zarah*, 67b, page 325, Hoffman brings forth the following quote: "The vessels of Gentiles, do they not impart a worsened flavor [to the food cooked in them]?" Actually, the answer is no. What the *Talmud* really says is: "*Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself [nebelah]; thou mayest give it unto the stranger that is within thy gates* - whatever is fit for use by a stranger is called *nebelah*, and whatever is unfit for use by a stranger is not called *nebelah*." Practising Jews have very strict dietary requirements, not only must they forgo the pleasure of Greasy Joe's special: double egg and bacon, but they must not consume certain fish, mix meat and milk, and G-d knows what else. There is no implication here that thou shalt not dine with those filthy *goyim*.

A good Christian like Mike Hoffman is obviously aghast at the blasphemies he claims to have found in the *Talmud*. Thus we are told on page H4 that Jesus - "Yeshu" - was executed because he practised sorcery. Let me get this straight, the guy walked on the water, he turned water into wine, he raised the dead, he fed 5,000 people with the contents of a picnic hamper, and he didn't practice sorcery? Then who the fuck was he, David Copperfield? On page H5, *Gittin* (28) tells us, we are told, that the great JC is being boiled in hot excrement. Heck, that's what happens to all sinners. Haven't you read your *Bible*, boy? If you sin, you will go to HELL. Ain't that what those good 'ol boys in the Deep South tells de white folks?

Incidentally, on page 261, *Gittin* reveals that "Whoever mocks at the words of the Sages is punished with boiling hot excrement." And didn't Jesus mock at the words of the Sages? However, it must be pointed out that different rabbis had different opinions of Jesus, the same as they did on any number of people, and subjects. One thing's for certain though, whatever Yahweh did to Jesus ain't nothing to what Allah's gonna do to Salman Rushdie. And talking of blasphemy, real and imagined, whatever rants and raves may appear in the *Talmud*, surely no rabbinic scholar ever wrote anything half as blasphemous of "Our Lord" as the obscene piece of shite that was published in the homosexual rag *Gay News* and which led, in 1976, to Mary Whitehouse initiating a private prosecution against the paper for blasphemous libel. (29) From what I've heard though, Hoffman hates queers almost as much as he hates Jews, and believes that if the Holocaust had been directed against homos it would have been equally justified. Well, even Hoffman has his good points.

However, returning to the Jews and JC, a quote from an extant rabbi is perhaps in order, so here is something from Yours Truly's *A "Goy" Pries Into The "Talmud"*.

Me: "Jesus is in hell and is being punished by being boiled in hot semen. Christians are boiled in s--t." (Attributed to *Gittin* 57a).

Rabbi Cohen: The last phrase of that I haven't come across anywhere, but the first phrase is taken out of context from Balaam. Balaam caused the Israelites to sin with the daughters of Midian, (30) and for that reason his punishment in Hell bears some relation to the kind of sin he caused others to do.

Me: The contents of this first bit of filth, there is such a passage in *Gittin*?

Rabbi Cohen: That's right, in relation to Onkelos [a Roman pagan] who wanted to [and did] convert to Judaism, and he conjured up these ghosts: Titus, Jesus and Balaam to consult them. There's a bit about Balaam being

punished in the Underworld by being boiled in hot semen. Titus had actually desecrated the temple in the Holy of Holies and had relations with a whore on a scroll of the *Torah* in the Holy of Holies, just to sort of really rub it in as it were. According to our tradition, when Titus was coming to his end and he knew he was going to be punished, he left instructions in his will that he should be cremated and that his body and the ashes should be scattered in different seas. He thought in that way that God (31) would never be able to punish him because he'd never be able to get all the bits together again in order to conjure up his soul to punish him. (32)

There's nothing in that passage which is derogatory of Jesus. Having been in the position that he tried to cause people to deviate from the traditions of the sages of Israel, he was consulted by Onkelos, and he said, (words to the effect) that anyone who tries to cause them harm is really, in effect, harming the pupil of his own eye, in other words, himself. His words were, if not complimentary, then the most positive of all those consulted. The *Talmud* actually says in his praise that even though he went against the sages he was far more positive than the others were. (33)

End of quote. Yes, I'm sure, Rabbi, but whatever Onkelos said, whatever the *Talmud* says, whatever Rabbi Cohen says, are we really supposed to take these fairy stories from the beginning of recorded history seriously? And are we supposed to connect them with the political gangsters of the ADL, the peddlars of the Holocaust, and Machiavellian slimeballs like Gerry sweepings-of-the-ghetto Gable? Apparently we are, if Hoffman's poisonous screeds are to be given any credence at all.

Another note here. The *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* says that *Toledoth Yeshu* - a tract hostile to Jesus - was written in Mediaeval times, but is the work of a single Jew which has never had any currency among the great mass of Jews, and that, "...the Talmudic statements about him are not about the real Jesus, but about an imagined originator of a hateful persecution." (34)

The same passage continues: "It was only in modern times, when Jews could examine the pages of the New Testament without fear of persecution and dispassionately, that a new attitude toward Jesus on the part of the Jews was revealed.

"Jacob Emden, in the 18th cent., had already stated his conviction that Jesus had conferred a blessing upon the world, by replacing heathenism by ethical teaching..." (35)

Jesus was, in proper parlance, a Revisionist (though not a la Hoffman, needless to say). The claim that Jesus, the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) or any other religious leader, prophet or theologian has conferred any sort of blessing on the world either before or since is highly debatable, but certainly the *Torah*-true Jews have given the world less cause for concern than their ugly - and for the most part totally irreligious - cousins in the Zionist and "anti-fascist" movements, who are the people Hoffman should really be directing his anger against.

Before we return to *Baba Kamma*, a few words about Hell a la *Talmud*. When most of us - us *Aryan goyim* that is (36) - think about Hell, it conjures up an image of boiling in oil for all eternity, fire, brimstone and damnation, etc. The addition of excrement and semen to this, whether boiling hot or not, does not exactly make it a more attractive place. However, the Jewish concept of Hell is very different. According to Rabbi Goldstein it is where one undergoes a cleansing process. The Jewish encyclopaedias expand on this somewhat. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* has no entry for Hell; but the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* tells us that the *Talmud* has eight synonyms for it. One of these is Gehinnom. (37) According to one authority "...those who suffered in this world through poverty, unhappy marriage, or severe illness are exempt from Gehinnom." While according to the Maimonides school, "Gehinnom is merely a figure 'to express our idea of the existence of a future retribution, and must not be taken literally'". So going to Hell in the Jewish sense is not really such a terrible punishment; to the current writer it sounds more akin to the Eastern mystical concept of reincarnation. There is a lot more one could write about the Jewish concept of Hell, but as a lifelong atheist I must say it really doesn't interest me. Back to Hoffman's ravings and...

Baba Kamma 113a, page 664: "Jews may use lies ('subterfuges') to circumvent a Gentile." While in *Sanhedrin* 57a, page 389, "A Jew need not pay a Gentile ('Cuthean') the wages owed him for work." Evidently nobody told Marks & Spencer, which does raise one pertinent question. If the Jews control the economy as many of Mr Hoffman's fellow travellers believe, who is working for them?

Leaving this aside, this is in any case a total distortion; this passage actually refers to the conduct of legal disputes between Israelites and heathens, and does not advocate lying. There are though, cases when lying is justified, and it would be a foolish man - or a dishonest one - who says he would never tell a lie under any circumstances. Imagine the following scenario. Hoffman opens his front door to a caller, and standing on the step is a *Stürmer*-like Jew wearing a skullcap and holding an Uzi. "Where's that filthy anti-Semite, Hoffman?" he says, "the JDL wants to have a few words with him."

"Heck, fella, you just missed him. Can I take a message?"

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

Such a reply is more than a little dishonest, but would the gospel according to Mike Hoffman have any qualms about using such a "subterfuge" to deceive the Chosen Race? Would it, fuck!

On page H6 again, *Gittin* gets further mentions under the *Sick and Insane Teachings* sub-heading. Thus: "The Rabbis taught: On coming from a privy a man should not have sexual intercourse till he has waited long enough to walk half a *mil*, (38) because the demon of the privy is with him for that time; if he does, his children will be epileptic." And if he pulls his plonker while he's using the privy, he'll go blind. Again, are we really expected to take such old wives' tales from two thousand and more years ago as evidence of the sick and insane teachings of the Jewish religion? These words were written at a time when the world was believed to be flat, when disease was caused not by germs but by demons, and when all the tribes of the ancient world held all manner of weird beliefs about the nature of the universe, life, and each other. Grow up, Mike.

However, one teaching the current writer did find sick and insane a là Hoffman is the quote he reproduces from *Gittin* 69b, page 329, on page H6, namely, "To heal the disease of pleurisy ("catarrh") a Jew should take the excrement of a white dog and knead it with balsam, but if he can possibly avoid it he should not eat the dog's excrement as it loosens the limbs."

Leaving aside the fact that pleurisy is not catarrh - not on this side of the Pond, at any rate - this quote is accurate. Having said that, however, I was aware that this conflicts with the usually impeccably high standards of hygiene set by the rabbinate. Is this some sort of anomaly in everybody's favourite kosher cuisine? No. According to the Rabbi again, this is a traditional cure for the said disease. Notwithstanding the fact that if you did ingest the turds of a white dog, or any dog, the last thing you would be concerned about is inflammation of the lungs, I can't imagine anyone being cured of anything by such a foul practice. Except breathing, perhaps. However, the Rabbi assured me that this was a genuine *cure*, (39) although he also assured me that if he were stricken with a lung infection he would visit his pharmacist and purchase a bottle of Dr Cohen's delicious kosher linctus.

So where is all this calumny and nonsense leading us? I know exactly where it is leading Mike Hoffman: to Hebron. Here's how. Pages H7 and H8 dig up the infamous *Tob shebe goyyim harog* which, he tells us, translates as "Even the best of the Gentiles should all be killed". The last time I saw this quote in print it was dished out by a slightly more philo-Semitic author: William Grimstad. On page 14 of his at times highly amusing *The Six Million Reconsidered*, Grimstad renders it thus: "Even the best of the Gentiles should be killed". Note the word *all* is missing, but then as both a long-serving Nazi and a paid and accredited agent of Saudi Arabia, Grimstad is somewhat more charitable towards the Chosen Race than Michael A. Hoffman II. (40)

According to the latter, this pronouncement shows the inbred contempt of the Jewish religion for the rest of humanity, even though "This original Talmud passage has been concealed in translation." The plain truth though is that such pronouncements were made long ago against various tribes the Israelites were at war with, or living side by side with acrimoniously, and have long since been rescinded, or if they haven't been rescinded *officially*, they have been written out of the *Talmud*, out of the *Torah*, and out of everything Judaism stands for by their having lapsed. Even then, such pronouncements were not necessarily half as terrible then as they sound today. (41) Consider the following: "We slaughtered the Yids!" This sounds truly terrible without the following qualification: Manchester United 4 - Tottenham Hotspur 0. Leaving that aside, Hoffman moves straight from *Tob shebe goyyim harog* to "One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail."

Hoffman's reasoning is that Barukh Goldstein (42) "an orthodox Jew from Brooklyn" was acting out the alleged genocidal edicts of the *Talmud* when he massacred twenty-nine Moslems at prayer at the Ibrahimi Mosque. (43) Tempting as this is to the uninitiated, to the anti-Semitic or to the deranged, (44) there is a hole a mile wide in his reasoning, and Yours Truly is about to drive a bus through it.

As well as being a pathological anti-Semite, and demented, Hoffman is a prize arsehole, and not because of anything he writes or says on the Jewish Question, but simply because he pays more attention to what people say than to what they do. In short, although he realises, obviously, that the world is full of damned liars and hypocrites, and that the Jews have more than their fair share of both, he takes at face value the asinine drivel of the *Talmud* and other Jewish scriptures while completely ignoring the reaction of contemporary Jewry.

Obviously, Jews everywhere condemned the Hebron massacre (with the exception of Goldstein's fellow Kahanists, which appears to have included the rabbi at his funeral). (45) If the Jewish Establishments throughout the world hadn't condemned such an outrage they could justly have expected a worldwide media pogrom. The Zionists though condemned it only because they knew damned well that the eyes of the world were upon them, and they condemned it in a whisper. What though did the Jews, the "real Jews" do? In London, the men in the black hats and caftans organised a demonstration in Baker Street to protest against both the massacre "and the idea behind it" in the words of Rabbi Goldstein, proclaiming, among other things, that the master race philosophy of Zionism "annuls the status of the rabbis who preach it".

Have the Zionists ever done anything like this? Have they fuck. In the aftermath of Sabra and Shatila they were whining, wailing and branding people anti-Semitic left, right and centre. Never mind the fact that hundreds, perhaps even more than a thousand, people had been murdered in cold blood, many, many of them women, children and old people. They were only filthy Arab dogs; what was most important was that "the Jewish community" might be *scapegoated* on account of this *unfortunate* if terrible *incident*. Who knows, Sabra and Shatila might have led somebody to daub a swastika on a synagogue in Monsey or Golders Green, and that would have been the ultimate evil. Why, if they'd done that they'd be shovelling the Jews into *gas chambers* next, just like the Nazis did in Auschwitz. Or was it Dachau?

Believe it or not, in the wake of Sabra and Shatila, the Israeli government actually had the front to issue a communique which claimed that "On the New Year, a blood libel was levelled at the Jewish State and its Government, against the Israeli Defence Forces." (46) It also refused to cooperate with the inquiry into the massacres and advised Israelis not to. Perhaps the nadir came when Organised Jewry in Britain reported none other than loony "anti-racist", anti-Nazi Ken Livingstone to the Attorney-General for publishing a cartoon attacking the Zionists as the murdering scum and enemies of humanity they are. (47) Such Zionist dirty tricks have been well documented by authors on both sides of the Atlantic and needs no elaboration here.

The point I am making is that it is the filthy cabal known as political Zionism which has been in the forefront of the destruction of freedom of speech, and virtually all our other freedoms, on the spurious pretext of saving the world from the mythical Nazi conspiracy. They have almost singlehandedly destroyed free speech in Britain, on race issues at least, but when the chips are down, they don't give a flying fuck about anything or anyone besides themselves and their precious Israel. "Israel über alles" might well be their battle cry. The real Jews on the other hand, the *Torah*-true Jews, who keep a low profile on most issues, came forward, stood up and said: "This is wrong!" thus refuting Hoffman's calumny on the *Talmud* that Gentiles are outside the protection of the law. It was the real Jews, those strange men in even stranger garb who live under 613 Biblical commandments, who don't eat pork and who wash their hands in a ritual way, it was they who denounced the outrage of Hebron, who denounce other Zionist outrages. And who denounce the *Chosen Race* (in reality Master Race) philosophy and cancerous ideology of political Zionism. It was the real Jews who stood up and said this is not done in our name; the blood of a goy is not worth less than the blood of a Jew. And what the fuck does Hoffman do? He blames them for Hebron!

Hoffman's Heresy: The Jewish Question, The Fallacy Of Equivocation, And How The Zionists Exploit It

If I say to a foreigner who is learning English that I like listening to loud music, he may well understand me. If I tell him he is wearing a loud shirt, he may well find difficulty in comprehending my words. A loud shirt is of course not the same thing as loud music, or rather the word loud has been used here in two entirely different contexts. One cannot compare the *loudness* of a shirt with that of a rock band because they are different qualitatively. In addition to all the fabricated documents, *Protocols Of Zion* etc., and other nonsense which clouds the so-called Jewish Question, the wilful confusion of the word Jew has been used by anti-Semites, and ruthlessly exploited by those (including Jews themselves) who claim to be defending the Jews, or *opposing anti-Semitism* as Gerry sweepings-of-the-ghetto Gable calls it.

To take one prosaic example, some Holocaust Revisionists - many of them - claim that the Holocaust is a fraud effected by the forces of political Zionism for material gain and to batter the wicked *Aryan goyim* over the head forevermore. So-called anti-fascists and their fellow travellers claim that the "Nazis" are thus accusing "the Jews" of fabricating the Holocaust. Leaving aside the well-documented fact that Nazi ideology and Holocaust Revisionism are totally disparate, nobody except the crazies accuses the Jews per se of inventing the Holocaust. And the few people who do, accuse them of every sin in the world since the snake tempted Eve.

In short, while some crazies really do believe there is a massive Jewish world conspiracy, *Protocols* and all, the vast majority of people don't. On the other hand, certain individuals and organisations tar all Jews with the same brush in order to blame them for their own misdeeds. Thus, Gerry Gable, whose hatred for Western Man and his democratic institutions drips off the pages of his grotesque race-hate magazine, is in the forefront of attacking as Nazis those people who portray the Jews as manipulators of the media and poisoners of the racial soul. The fact that he is himself a manipulator of the media, poisoner of the racial soul and much else besides, probably

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

has more than a little to do with it. Yet this obscene, *Aryan*-hating crypto-Jew, who looks as though he's leapt off the pages of *Der Stürmer*, has probably never seen the inside of a synagogue in his life, except perhaps when he had his prick clipped. (48)

Hoffman echoes the same mistake constantly through the pages of his anti-Jewish hate-sheet *Revisionist Researcher*, and this really is a shame because the magazine does contain some excellent material. Volume 4, Number 7 contains an excellent debunking of Steven Spielberg's anti-German poison *Schindler's List* (or *Swindler's Mist* as Hoffman calls it). An in-depth analysis by historian Alan Critchley demolishes Spielberg's pseudo-documentary, exposing it as a dramatisation of a novel dressed up as an historical document. Unfortunately, Hoffman - and author Critchley - fall into the trap of blaming the *Talmud* for Thomas Keneally's (49) and Steven Spielberg's sins. Thus we are told on page 3 in reference to a passage from the *Talmud* concerning the saving of lives that "The actual Talmud verse states: 'Whosoever preserves a single soul of Israel, Scripture ascribes to him as though he had preserved a complete world'...The genuine Talmud verse *only praises the saving of Jewish lives*. Non-Jews are not regarded as human..." This is garbage. How about the following quote from *Gittin* 61a, pages 286-7: "Our Rabbis have taught: 'We support the poor of the heathen along with the poor of Israel, and visit the sick of the heathen along with the sick of Israel, and bury the dead of the heathen along with the dead of Israel, in the interests of peace'." Nothing wrong with that, surely? (50)

Leaving that aside though, Hoffman misses the point entirely, yet again. In his excellent study *ISRAEL and the NEW WORLD ORDER*, Andrew Hurley discusses the role of Zionist rabbis in perverting Talmudic texts to give aid and comfort to the Master Race philosophy of political Zionism. And to justify murder and even genocide. (51)

Spielberg is a Jew in name only. Like the rest of the Hollywood cabal he is "of Jewish origin". He doesn't wear a skullcap, doesn't keep kosher; for all his insane ravings at Judaism's holiest book, Hoffman probably knows more about the *Torah* than Spielberg does. Spielberg is spewing out Zionist poison, lies and hatred, but what Hoffman doesn't or won't realise is that Spielberg is himself a victim of Zionist indoctrination. (52)

Yes, I know the Jews control - or did control - Hollywood, but who are these "Jews"? Not the men in black hats and caftans, that's for sure; they don't even watch TV! (53) Hoffman even directs his insane ravings at Tony Greenstein, the Brighton-based "anti-fascist" Jew who was sent a copy of his *Tales of the Holohoax* "comic" through the post. (54) Yet Greenstein is not only an "anti-fascist" he is a passionate anti-Zionist who has no qualms about calling a spade a spade and denouncing Zionist atrocities, ideology and hatemongering.

Even more incredibly, Hoffman believes his *Stürmer*-like "comic" is satire. In the one and only letter I have received from him to date, (dated 12 September anno Domini 1994!) Hoffman says "Satire is a far more powerful weapon against religious hysteria than 'rational, dispassionate' debate. (55) By means of lampoon we hold a mirror up to the distortions of religious belief and through humor disarm them." What the fuck has Zionism to do with religion? Nothing.

Having made that last statement, I had better justify it, to Hoffman if to no one else. In *Revisionist Researcher* Volume 4, Number 7 (the *Swindler's Mist* issue), he publishes a cartoon of "An Israeli settler after seeing too many *Holocaust* movies". (See page 20). He also quotes from the *New York Times* of February 26, 1994; Michael Lerner, who is presumably also one of the Chosen, claims here that: "...Jews raised on a steady diet of Holocaust stories and anti-Arab racism, are determined to show that Jews can be powerful--even if that power can be exercised only against an unarmed and essentially defenseless Palestinian population."

Hoffman comments here that "This is public acknowledgement, in the pages of the leading American newspaper of record, that *Holocaust* movies, books and museum exhibits fit the judicial definition of hate propaganda: the instigation of mass murder."

There remains the fact that Barukh Goldstein was a religious Jew as well as a Zionist, and a Zionist rabbi did state at Goldstein's funeral that "One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail." Superficially, this gives spurious credence to the claims of Hoffman and his ilk that Judaism lies at the root of the Jewish *problem* rather than Zionism. However, the true facts are very different.

When Zionism came into being, it was condemned by all Jewish religious leaders, and a great many *secular* Jews as well. (56) Notwithstanding the fact that all ideologies have little or no popular support when they are founded, Zionism was an ideology which was opposed vigorously. To take just one example, the first World Zionist Congress was held at Basle in Switzerland because the German rabbis chased it out of Munich. (57) During the 1940s the American Council for Judaism fought the heresy, but eventually succumbed under pressure from the Zionist movement. (58)

Clearly, from its founding by the assimilated Jew Theodor Herzl, (59) to the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948, and down to the present day, the Zionist movement has been secular. Zionism is a political ideology

rather than a religious dogma. It is the Jewish religion which has been perverted (and polluted) by Zionism, and not vice versa. Here I will draw an analogy with the so-called Christian Identity Movement. (60)

The Christian Identity Movement is largely a front for Southern white supremacists and White Separatists. There are various manifestations of it, but many, most or all of the Christian Identity "churches" preach a mystical anti-Semitism, dragging in not only the *Protocols Of Zion* but the Order of the Illuminati as well. Jews are seen as the spawn of the Devil, and the Negro, indeed all non-whites, are referred to as "mud people". In some literature the Negro especially is portrayed as "not of Adamic stock" and therefore a beast, ie not human.

Whatever the bizarre theology of Christian Identity, most of this movement's adherents have no interest whatsoever in any aspect of Christianity, God, or anything else save preaching hatred of other races. In short, they are con-men who hide behind the cross. By the same token, Zionists, hard core Zionists, are political (and, in the case of the Barukh Goldsteins of this world), religious, gangsters who hide behind the label Jew. This does not mean that they are insincere anymore than the adherents of Christian Identity are insincere; certainly they (Zionist fundamentalists) believe that the Jew is always persecuted, always the underdog, and by virtue of this, if not of his race and the *Holocaust*, that the Jew is entitled to ride roughshod over the rest of mankind, as indeed Zionist leaders have done for the past half century.

Hoffman is no adherent of Christian Identity, but the fact that he would tar the likes of Rabbi Goldstein with the same brush as the deranged mass murderer Barukh Goldstein, indeed, the fact that he sees *the Jew* only as a Jew, proves that the man is not only bigoted and evil but obviously demented as well. In short, like the ADLers and their fellow travellers who accept the Holocaust and the twin "uniquenesses" of *Aryan* evil/Jewish suffering as an article of faith, Hoffman is totally obsessed with the Jewish evil, and no amount of logical argument, reason or rational debate will ever convince him otherwise.

On page 20 is reproduced both a letter from Hoffman to the editor of the American magazine the *Skeptic* (61) and one of his stickers advertising his ravings. For a correspondent to write to a hostile editor branding him a fucking idiot is one thing, but as his letter to the current writer demonstrates clearly, Hoffman interprets his own, particularly virulent strand of anti-Semitism and dementia as satire. It will be a wonder if anyone else does. In spite of the quality of his research, Hoffman should be avoided like the plague by all Revisionists and objective seekers of the truth. He is poison to our movement. If I were of a conspiratorial mentality I would suggest that, rather than being the real McCoy, Hoffman was an ADL stooge, or a puppet in the pay of another arm of the Zionist octopus, like the anti-black, anti-Semitic, pseudo-Nazi, Searchlight stooge Ray Hill, who was anticipated by Sir Oswald Mosley nearly half a century before he came out as a "mole". (62)

Sadly, this is not the case. Hoffman is the real McCoy, he is a genuine Revisionist as well as a genuine anti-Semite, and he's doing a great job for the Zionist hate machine for the simple reason that his hatred is recognised by all, and just in case there is any mistake about it, it can be and is broadcast to the world. By Shermer publishing his letter and sticker for example. This is the public image of Revisionism, or the way the enemies of all races but one like to portray it in public. And they are aided and abetted in this enterprise by a complacent, cowardly and at times spineless media. A media which, just as Hoffman tars all Jews with the same brush, insists also on tarring all Revisionists with the same brush. A media which fails to recognise Jewish hatred, or even finds it impossible to believe that any Jew could be capable of the same kind of racial hatred of which the leaders of Organised Jewry are forever accusing the rest of mankind.

More than that, much more than that, while the media fails to recognise any Jewish evil or wrongdoing, Organised Jewry continues to exploit the fallacy of equivocation. Thus in their eyes and in the eyes of the public, not only is every Revisionist a Hoffman, but every Jew is a Dreyfus, an Anne Frank, (63) or a poor, persecuted innocent. The Jew is always powerless, at the mercy of anti-Semites who have nothing better to do than pogrom and murder the Chosen Race. Therefore the Jew - read the ADL, the Searchlight Organisation and a host of other crypto-Jewish race-hate organisations worldwide - can present themselves as the saviours of Western democracy and indeed of Western civilisation, a civilisation they are in fact doing their utmost to destroy. Therein lies the real folly of anti-Semitism, and the real heresy of Michael A. Hoffman II.

H 8

Isidore Singer, under the entry, "Gentile," (p. 617).

This original Talmud passage has been concealed in translation. *The Jewish Encyclopedia* states that, "...in the various versions the reading has been altered, 'The best among the Egyptians' being generally substituted." In the Soncino version: "the best of the heathens" (Minor Tractates, Soferim 41a-b]. Israelis annually take part in a national pilgrimage to the grave of Simon ben Yohai, to honor this rabbi who advocated the extermination of non-Jews. (*Jewish Press* of June 9, 1989, p. 56B).

On Purim, Feb. 25, 1994, Israeli army officer Baruch Goldstein, an orthodox Jew from Brooklyn, massacred 40 Palestinian civilians, including children, while they knelt in prayer in a mosque. Goldstein was a disciple of the late Rabbi Kahane who has stated that his view of Arabs as "dogs" is "from the Talmud." (Cf. CBS *60 Minutes*, "Kahane"). Univ. of Jerusalem Prof. Ehud Sprinzak described Kahane and Goldstein's philosophy: "They believe it's God's will that they commit violence against 'goyim,' a Hebrew term for non-Jews." (*NY Daily News*, Feb. 26, 1994, p. 5). Rabbi Yitzhak Ginsburg declared, "We have to recognize that Jewish blood and the blood of a goy are not the same thing." (*NY Times*, June 6, 1989, p. 5). Rabbi Yaacov Perrin says, "One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail." (*NY Daily News*, Feb. 28, 1994, p. 6).

Judeo-Christian Response to Talmud

Neither the modern popes or the modern preachers of Protestantism, have ever insisted that the rabbis of Judaism repudiate or condemn the Talmud. On the contrary, the heads of "Judeo-Christianity" have urged the followers of Christ to obey, honor and support the followers of the Talmud. Therefore, it should be obvious that "Judeo-Christianity" is the worst betrayer of Jesus Christ on earth today.

Copyright©1994 Old Order Brotherhood
By Warrant of John 18:37; Matthew 23:13-15
I Thess. 2:14-16; Titus 1:14; Luke 3:8-9; Rev. 3:9.

Order Extra Copies of this Tract:

15 copies: \$3.00. 50 copies: \$7.00.

100 copies for \$13. 500 for \$60.


Books Available: *Prophecy and Politics*. 210 pages, \$7 per copy. *Secret Societies and Psychological Warfare*. 115 pages \$8 per copy. Free shipping in the U.S. In N.Y. add 7% tax. CANADA and FOREIGN: Add 25% to all prices and pay in U.S. Funds from a U.S. Bank.

Wiswell Ruffin House
Box 236, Dresden, New York 14441

H 1

The Talmud Judaism's Holiest Book Documented and Exposed

©Copyright 1994 by The Old Order Brotherhood



Rabbi Joseph D. Soloveitchik

Top authority on the Talmud is also the "unchallenged leader of Orthodox Judaism" who ordained 'an entire generation of rabbis'

The Talmud is Judaism's holiest book. Its authority takes precedence over the Old Testament in Judaism. Evidence of this may be found in the Talmud itself, Erubin 21b (Soncino edition p. 149): "My son, be more careful in the observance of the words of the Scribes than in the words of the *Torah* (Old Testament)."

The supremacy of the Talmud over the Bible in the Israeli state may also be seen in the case of the Black Ethiopian Jews. Ethiopians have more knowledge of the Old Testament than the Israelis.

However, their religion is so ancient it pre-dates the Scribes' Talmud, of which they have no knowledge. According to the *N.Y. Times* of Sept. 29, 1992, p.4: "The problem is that Ethiopian Jewish tradition goes no further than the Bible or Torah; the later Talmud and other commentaries that form the basis of modern traditions never came their way." Because they don't traffic in Talmudic traditions, the Black Ethiopians are discriminated against and have been forbidden to perform marriages, funerals and other services in the Israeli state.

Rabbi Joseph D. Soloveitchik is regarded as one of the most influential rabbis of the 20th century, the

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

H2

"unchallenged leader" of Orthodox Judaism and the top international authority on *halakha* (Jewish religious law). Soloveitchik was responsible for instructing and ordaining more than 2,000 rabbis, "an entire generation" of Jewish leadership.

N.Y. Times religion reporter Ari Goldman described the basis of the rabbi's authority: "Soloveitchik came from a long line of distinguished Talmudic scholars...Until his early 20s, he devoted himself almost exclusively to the study of the Talmud...He came to Yeshiva University's Elchanan Theological Seminary where he remained the pre-eminent teacher in the Talmud...He held the title of Leib Merkin professor of Talmud...sitting with his feet crossed in front of a table bearing an open volume of the Talmud." (N.Y. Times, April 10, 1993, p. 38).

Nowhere does Goldman refer to Soloveitchik's knowledge of the Bible as the basis for being one of the top world authorities on Jewish law. The rabbi's credentials are predicated upon his mastery of the Talmud. All other studies are clearly secondary. Britain's *Jewish Chronicle* of March 26, 1993 states that in religious school (*yeshiva*), Jews are "devoted to the Talmud to the exclusion of everything else."

The Scribes claim the Talmud is partly a collection of traditions Moses gave them in oral form. These had not yet been written down in Jesus' time. Christ condemned the traditions of the *Mishnah* (early Talmud) and those who taught it (Scribes and Pharisees), because it nullified Biblical teachings.

In Mark 7:3 Jesus referred to the *Mishnah* ("tradition of the elders") which would later comprise a major portion of the Talmud: "Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition." Christ condemned the Scribes and Pharisees because of their reliance on the *Mishnah*, which He said resulted in "Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition" (Mark 7:9, 13), due to the fact that they placed it above the Old Testament as their authority.

To the *Mishnah* the rabbis later added the *Gemara* (rabbinical commentaries). Together these comprise the Talmud. There are two versions, the Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud. The Babylonian Talmud is regarded as the authoritative version: "The authority of the Babylonian Talmud is also greater than that of the Jerusalem Talmud. In cases of doubt the former is decisive." (R.C. Musaph-Andriesse, *From Torah to Kabbalah: A Basic Introduction to the Writings of Judaism*, p. 40). Our study is based on the Jewish-authorized, English translation of the Babylonian Talmud: the Soncino edition. Every selection we cite is documented directly from the text of the authoritative Soncino

H3

Talmud. We have published herein the authenticated sayings of the Jewish Talmud. Look them up for yourself. To verify the Talmud passages cited, refer to the Soncino edition Talmud, which may be found in large university and seminary libraries. The Soncino Talmud may also be purchased from book dealers.

Cautionary note: Another English translation, the Steinsaltz edition, has been published recently. While the authoritative Soncino edition Talmud was published for Jews who do not read Hebrew well, the Steinsaltz edition is intended mainly for Gentile consumption, as a public relations gimmick. It is not a reliable or accurate version of the Talmud.

Translations: The translators of the Talmud sometimes translate the Hebrew word *goyim* (Gentiles) under any number of terms such as heathen, Cuthean, Egyptian, idolater etc. But these are actually references to Gentiles (all non-Jews). See for example footnote 5 on p. 361 and footnote 5 on p. 388 of the Soncino edition Talmud: "Cuthean (Samaritan) was here substituted for the original *goy*..." Christians are sometimes referred to by the code word Min or Minim. For proof of this, see the Soncino edition Talmud, p. 604 (footnote 12).

Some Teachings of the Talmud

Erubin 21b (p. 149-150). Whosoever disobeys the rabbis deserves death and will be punished by being boiled in hot excrement in hell.

Moed Kattan 17a (p. 107). If a Jew is tempted to do evil he should go to a city where he is not known and do the evil there.

Non-Jews are Not Human

Baba Mezia 114a-114b. Only Jews are human ("Only ye are designated *men*"). Also see Kerithoth 6b (p.45) under the sub-head, "Oil of Anointing" and Berakoth 58a (pp. 361-362) in which Gentile women are designated animals ("she-asses").

Jews are Divine

Sanhedrin 58b. (p. 398). If a heathen (Gentile) hits a Jew, the Gentile must be killed. Hitting a Jew is the same as hitting God.

O.K. to Cheat Non-Jews

Sanhedrin 57a (p. 389). A Jew need not pay a Gentile ("Cuthean") the wages owed him for work.

Jews Have Superior Legal Status

Baba Kamma 37b (p.211). "If an ox of an Israelite gores an ox of a Canaanite there is no liability; but if an ox of a Canaanite gores an ox of an Israelite...the payment is to be in full."

Jews May Steal from Non-Jews

H4

Baba Mezia 24a (p. 151). If a Jew finds an object lost by a Gentile ("heathen") it does not have to be returned. (Affirmed also in Baba Kamma 113b).

Sanhedrin 76a (p. 517). God will not spare a Jew who "marries his daughter to an old man or takes a wife for his infant son or returns a lost article to a Cuthean..."

Jews May Rob and Kill Non-Jews

Sanhedrin 57a (p. 388). When a Jew murders a Gentile ("Cuthean"), there will be no death penalty. What a Jew steals from a Gentile he may keep.

Baba Kamma 37b (p. 213). Gentiles are outside the protection of the law and God has "exposed their money to Israel."

Jews May Lie to Non-Jews

Baba Kamma 113a (p. 664). Jews may use lies ("subterfuges") to circumvent a Gentile.

Non-Jewish Children Sub-Human

Yebamoth 98a (pp. 670-671). All Gentile children are animals.

Abodah Zarah 36b (p. 176). Gentile girls are in a state of *niddah* (filth) from birth.

Abodah Zarah 22a-22b (pp. 113-114). Gentiles prefer sex with cows.

Abodah Zarah 67b (p. 325). "The vessels of Gentiles, do they not impart a worsened flavor to the food cooked in them?"

Insults Against Blessed Mary

Sanhedrin 106a (p. 725). Says Jesus' mother was a whore: "She who was the descendant of princes and governors played the harlot with carpenters." Also in footnote #2 to Shabbath 104b (p. 504) it is stated that in the "uncensored" text of the Talmud it is written that Jesus mother, "Miriam the hairdresser," had sex with many men.

Gloats over Christ Dying Young

A passage from Sanhedrin 106 gloats over the early age at which Jesus died: "Hast thou heard how old Balaam (Jesus) was?--He replied: It is not actually stated but since it is written, *Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days* it follows that he was thirty-three or thirty-four years old."

Says Jesus was a Sorcerer

Sanhedrin 43a (p. 281). Says Jesus ("Yeshu" and in footnote #6, Yeshu "the Nazarene") was executed because he practiced sorcery.

H5

Horrible Blasphemy of Our Lord

Gittin 57a (p. 261). Says Jesus (see footnote #4) is being boiled in shit ("hot excrement").

Sanhedrin 43a (pp. 281-282). Jesus deserved execution: "On the eve of the Passover, Yeshu was hanged...Do you suppose that he was one for whom a defense could be made? Was he not a *Mesith* (enticer)?"

Attacks Christians and their Books

Rosh Hashanah 17a (pp. 64-65). Christians ("minim") and others who reject the Talmud will go to hell and be punished there for all generations (see footnote #11 on p. 64 for the definition of minim).

Sanhedrin 90a (p. 680). Those who read the New Testament ("uncanonical books," see footnote #9) will have no portion in the world to come.

Shabbath 116a (p. 569). Jews must destroy the books of the Christians, i.e. the New Testament. See footnote #6.

Sick and Insane Teachings

Gittin 69a (p. 329). To heal his flesh a Jew should take dust that lies within the shadow of an outdoor toilet, mix it with honey and eat it.

Shabbath 41a. (p. 190). The law regulating the rule for how to urinate in a holy way is given.

Yebamoth 63a (p. 420). States that Adam had sexual intercourse with all the animals in the Garden of Eden.

Yebamoth 63a (p. 420). Declares that agriculture is the lowest of occupations.

Sanhedrin 55b (p.376). A Jew may marry a three year old girl (specifically, three years "and a day" old).

Sanhedrin 54b (p. 371). A Jew may have sex with a child as long as the child is less than nine years old.

Kethuboth 11b (p. 58). "When a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl it is nothing."

Yebamoth 59b (p. 397). "A woman who had intercourse with a beast is eligible to marry a Jewish priest. A woman who has sex with a demon is also eligible to marry a Jewish priest.

Abodah Zarah 17a (p. 87). States that there is not a

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

H 6

where in the world that Rabbi Eleazar has not had sex with.

Hagigah 27a (p. 171). States that no rabbi can ever go to hell.

Baba Mezia 59b. (p.353). A rabbi debates God and defeats Him. God admits the rabbi won the debate.

Gittin 70a (p.333). "The Rabbis taught: On coming from a privy (outdoor toilet) a man should not have sexual intercourse till he has waited long enough to walk half a mile, because the demon of the privy is with him for that time; if he does, his children will be epileptic."

Gittin 69b (p. 329). To heal the disease of pleurisy ("catarrh") a Jew should "take the excrement of a white dog and knead it with balsam, but if he can possibly avoid it he should not eat the dog's excrement as it loosens the limbs."

Pesachim 111a (p. 571). It is forbidden for dogs, women or palm trees to pass between two men, nor may others walk between dogs, women or palm trees. Special dangers are involved if the women are menstruating or sitting at a crossroads.

Menahoth 43b-44a (p. 264). A Jewish man is obligated to say the following prayer every day: Thank you God for not making me a Gentile, a woman or a slave.

Shabbath 86a-86b (p. 409). Because Jews are holy they do not have sex during the day unless the house can be made dark. A Jewish scholar can have sex during the day if he uses his garment like a tent to make it dark.

Tall Tales of a Roman Holocaust

Here are two early "Holocaust" tales from the Talmud: Gittin 57b (p.266). Claims that four billion Jews were killed by the Romans in the city of Bethar. Gittin 58a (pp. 269-270). Claims that 16 million Jewish children were wrapped in scrolls and burned alive by the Romans. (Ancient demography indicates that there were not 16 million Jews in the entire world at that time, much less 16 million Jewish children or four billion Jews).

A Revealing Admission

Abodah Zarah 70a (p.336). The question was asked of the rabbi whether some wine stolen in Pumbeditha might be used or if it was defiled, due to the fact that the thieves might have been Gentiles (a Gentile

H 7

touching wine would make the wine unclean). The rabbi says not to worry, that the wine is permissible for Jewish use because the majority of the thieves in Pumbeditha, the place where the wine was stolen, are Jews

Pharisaic Rituals

Erubin 21b (p. 150). "Rabbi Akiba said to him, 'Give me some water to wash my hands.' 'It will not suffice for drinking,' the other complained, 'will it suffice for washing your hands?'

"What can I do?' the former replied, 'when for neglecting the words of the Rabbis one deserves death? It is better that I myself should die than that I transgress against the opinion of my colleagues.'" [This is the ritual hand washing condemned by Jesus in Matthew 15: 1-9].

"Great Rabbi" Deceives A Woman

Kallah 51a (Soncino Minor Tractates). Teaches that God approves of rabbis who lie:

"The elders were once sitting in the gate when two young lads passed by; one covered his head and the other uncovered his head. Of him who uncovered his head Rabbi Eliezer remarked that he is a bastard. Rabbi Joshua remarked that he is the son of a *niddah* (a child conceived during a woman's menstrual period). Rabbi Akiba said that he is both a bastard and a son of a *niddah*.

"They said, 'What induced you to contradict the opinion of your colleagues?' He replied, 'I will prove it concerning him.' He went to the lad's mother and found her sitting in the market selling beans.

"He said to her, 'My daughter, if you will answer the question I will put to you, I will bring you to the world to come.' (eternal life). She said to him, 'Swear it to me.' Rabbi Akiba, *taking the oath with his lips but annulling it in his heart*, said to her, 'What is the status of your son?' She replied, 'When I entered the bridal chamber I was *niddah* (menstruating) and my husband kept away from me; but my best man had intercourse with me and this son was born to me.' Consequently the child was both a bastard and the son of a *niddah*. It was declared, '...Blessed be the God of Israel Who Revealed His Secret to Rabbi Akiba...'

Genocide Advocated by Talmud

Minor Tractates. Soferim 15, Rule 10. This is the saying of Rabbi Simon ben Yohai: *Tob shebe goyyim harog* ("Even the best of the Gentiles should all be killed").

This passage is not from the Soncino edition but is from the original Hebrew of the Babylonian Talmud as quoted by the 1907 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, published by Funk and Wagnalls and compiled by

70a

A B O D A H Z A R A H

finds a purse on the Sabbath he may carry it for distances less than four cubits.¹

A lion once roared in an [Israelite] wine-press and a heathen [who was working in it], on hearing this, hid among the jars. Raba said: The wine is permitted on the ground that he must have thought, 'Just as I am hiding here, so also may the Israelite be hiding behind me and watching me.'

Some thieves came up² to Pumbeditha and opened many casks. Raba said: The wine is permitted. What was his reason?—Because the majority of thieves [in that part of the country] are Israelites. The same thing happened in Nehardea and Samuel said: The wine is permitted. According to whom [was this decision made]? Was it according to R. Eliezer who said: When there is uncertainty about his entrance³ he is undefiled; for we have learnt: If a person entered [the fields in] a valley during the rainy season⁴ and there was a source of defilement in a certain field, and he said, 'I walked in that place but am not sure whether I did or did not enter that field,' R. Eliezer says: When there is uncertainty about his entrance⁵ he is undefiled but if the uncertainty is about his having touched [the unclean object] he is defiled!⁶—No, it is different there [in the case of the thieves] because there are some who open [the casks] to search for money;⁷ thus there is a double uncertainty.⁸

- (1) I.e., he carries it a distance less than four cubits and stops a while, and so on until he reaches his house. This explains why purses are not found in the streets on the Sabbath. (2) [From some district in the South (v. Obermeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 253).] (3) Whether a ritually clean person had entered a ritually defiled place. Similarly here there is doubt whether the thieves were heathens. (4) The fields are then sown and are regarded as a private domain. (5) Into the field where the defiled object was. (6) Toh. VI. 5; v. B.B. (Sonc. ed.) p. 225. (7) [So Rashi. The difficulty is obvious. *V.l.*: 'Since they opened many casks (it is clear that) the intention was for money.' *V. D.S. a.l.*, n. 9. This implies that in Nehardea too 'many' casks were opened. The word is missing in *cur. edd.* but occurs in several texts; cf. *Tosaf. s.v. פתחו*.] (8) Besides the doubt whether they were heathens, there was the additional doubt whether they interfered with the wine since they were only searching for money. [In this case even the Rabbis who oppose R. Eliezer will agree that the wine is permitted.]

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

ABODAH ZARAH

70b

[70b] A [heathen] girl¹ was found among jars of wine holding some of the froth in her hand. Raba said: The wine is permitted on the ground that she probably obtained it from the outside of the cask, and although none was there any more² [at the time she was discovered] we say she happened to find some.

Some troops³ once came up to Nehardea and opened several casks. When R. Dimi arrived [from Palestine] he said: A similar occurrence came before R. Eleazar and he permitted [the wine], but I do not know whether he did so because he agreed with the view of R. Eliezer who said that when there is uncertainty about his entrance he is undefiled or whether he did so because he held the opinion that the majority of the men who were in the troops⁴ were Israelites. But if that is so⁵ this is not a case of uncertainty about entrance; but uncertainty about touching!⁶—Since, however, they opened many,⁷ conclude that they opened them with the intention of [searching for money]⁸ and so it is like a case of uncertainty about entrance.⁹

An [Israelite] woman who dealt in wine left the key of her door in charge of a heathen woman. R. Isaac said in the name of R. Eleazar: A similar occurrence was once brought before our House of Study [and they permitted the wine because] they maintained that she only entrusted her with charge of the key.¹⁰ Abaye said: We have likewise learnt similarly: If a person entrusts his keys to an *'am ha-areẓ*, his things which are in a state of ritual purity remain undefiled because he only entrusted him with charge of the key.¹¹ Since his things which are in a state of ritual purity remain undefiled, this must be all the more true in the matter of *yen neseḥ*.

- (1) She being only a child, the presumption was that she knew nothing about disqualifying the wine and her intentions were innocent. (2) [Ms.M. omits 'any more'.] (3) [Or, 'a commander' (Rashi).] (4) [Lit., 'who came with those troops,' or with that commander.] (5) Viz., his doubt was whether they were Jews. [Delete, however, with Ms.M. 'if that is so.'] (6) In regard to which even R. Eliezer adopts the more rigorous view, since the doubt is whether it was Jews who opened the casks. (7) More casks than were required only for drinking. (8) And there was no thought of disqualifying the wine. (9) In respect of which a more lenient view is taken by R. Eliezer; and so the wine was permitted. (10) And not of the wine-store itself. (11) Toh. VII, 1.

A. Z. 23

337

wounded¹ by a splinter! No, said R. Zera,² in respect of a minor who made a declaration of refusal.³

R. Shimi b. Hiyya stated: A woman who had intercourse with a beast is eligible to marry a priest.⁴ Likewise it was taught: A woman who had intercourse with that which is no human being,⁵ though she is in consequence subject to the penalty of stoning,⁶ is nevertheless permitted to marry a priest.⁷

When R. Dimi came⁸ he related: It once happened at Haitalu⁹ that while a young woman was sweeping the floor¹⁰ a village dog¹¹ covered her from the rear,¹² and Rabbi permitted her to marry a priest. Samuel said: Even a High Priest. But was there a High Priest in the days of Rabbi?¹³—Rather, [Samuel meant]: Fit for a High Priest.

Raba of Parzakaia¹⁴ said to R. Ashi: Whence is derived the following statement which the Rabbis made: Harlotry is not applicable to bestial intercourse?—It is written, *Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot, or the price of a dog*,¹⁵ and yet we learned that the hire of a dog¹⁶ and the price of a harlot¹⁷ are permitted¹⁸ because it is said, *Even both these*,¹⁵ two only but not four.

- (1) Cf. *supra* p. 394, n. 8. (2) Rab's reason of 'previous carnal intercourse' was necessary. (3) *Mema'eneth*, v. Glos. Unnatural intercourse with her by her husband places the minor in the status of *be'ulah* (v. Glos.) but not in that of harlot, while her refusal to live with him does not give her the status of divorcee or widow but that of *mema'eneth*. Hence the necessity for Rab's statement that such a minor also is forbidden to marry a High Priest. (4) Even a High Priest. The result of such intercourse being regarded as a mere wound, and the opinion that does not regard an accidentally injured hymen as a disqualification does not so regard such an intercourse either. (5) A beast. (6) If the offence was committed in the presence of witnesses after due warning. (7) In the absence of witnesses and warning. (8) From Palestine to Babylon. (9) [Babylonian form for Aitalu, modern Aiterun N.W. of Kadesh, v. S. Klein, *Beiträge* p. 47]. (10) Lit., 'house'. (11) Or 'big hunting dog' (Rashi), 'ferocious dog' (Jast.), 'small wild dog' (Aruk). (12) A case of unnatural intercourse. (13) Judah ha-nasi (the Prince or Patriarch) I, who flourished 170-217 C.E., about a hundred years after the destruction of the second Temple. (14) So Bomberg ed.; MS.M., 'Parazika' (cf. Golds.); Cur. edd., 'Parkin'. (15) Deut. XXIII, 19. (16) The beast which a harlot receives for her intercourse with a dog. (17) A beast received as the price of a harlot who has been sold. (18) To be consecrated to the altar.

of witchcraft, even if there are all these [safeguards], we still fear, as in the case of a certain man who rode on an ass and was wearing his shoes; his shoes shrank, and his feet withered.

Our Rabbis taught: There are three who must not pass between [two men], nor may [others] pass between them, viz.: a dog, a palm tree, and a woman. Some say: a swine too; some say, a snake too. And if they pass between, what is the remedy?—Said R. Papa: Let them commence [a verse] with *el* [God] and end with *el*.¹ Others say: Let them commence [a Scriptural passage] with *lo* [not] and finish with *lo*.² If a menstruant woman passes between two [men], if it is at the beginning of her menses she will slay one of them,³ and if it is at the end of her menses she will cause strife between them. What is the remedy? Let them commence [a verse] with *el* and end with *el*. When two women sit at a cross-road, one on one side of the road, and one on the other side of the road, facing each other, they are certainly engaged in witchcraft. What is the remedy? If there is another road [available], let one go through it. While if there is no other road, [then] if another man is with him, let them clasp hands and pass through; while if there is no other man, let him say thus: 'Igrath Izlath. Asya, Belusia⁴ have been slain with arrows.'⁵

When one meets a woman coming up from her statutory *tebillah*,⁶ if [subsequently] he is the first to have intercourse, a spirit of immorality will infect him; while if she is the first to have intercourse, a spirit of immorality will infect her. What is the remedy? Let him say thus: 'He poureth contempt upon princes, and causeth them to wander in the waste, where there is no way.'⁷

R. Isaac said: What is meant by the verse, *Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me*?⁸ This refers to him who sleeps in the shadow of a single palm-tree or in the shadow of the moon. Now in respect to the shadow of a single palm-tree, this holds good only where the

(1) Rashbam: Num. XXIII, 22f, which commence and finish with *el* in Heb. (2) Ibid. 19. (3) I.e., cause perjury to one of them (Rashbam). (4) The demons by whose aid you seek to work witchcraft. (5) The text is obscure. (6) After her period of menstruation. (7) Ps. CVII, 40. (8) Ps. XXIII, 4.



An Israeli settler after seeing too many "Holocaust" movies


A System Clone

Lou Rollins, a hopeless optimist, thinks you are someone worth enlightening but from your letter to him about *Schindler's List* (SL) you appear to be just another system clone. SL is not a racist depiction of Germans? When it shows the entire German army as either evil automatons or mass murdering monsters? Suppose I made a flick, "Finklestein's Piss," about Israel and the Palestinians and it had not one redeeming Israeli Army (IDF) soldier in it—every one of 'em was either an evil robot or a monster—what would be your reaction? I'll bet dollars to dough-

nuts you'd be screaming about "hate propaganda" even tho' my movie would have two good Jews in it—Mr. and Mrs. Finklestein—two good Jews ought to be enough to balance my movie about Israeli Army crimes against Palestinians, eh Mister Shermer?

The truth is, you are a fucking idiot posing as an original intellectual. Hope you can read my handwriting.


—Michael A. Hoffman, II,
Dresden, NY



For the Next Six Million Years!
Published By Decree of Our State Religion
U.S. Holy Hoax Memorial Council.
Prevent Thought Crime. Worship and Obey the Chosen Pimplet

FORBIDDEN CITY

by JURGEN WOLFF



Above: a cartoon from the launch issue JAN/FEB 1995 of the anti-censorship magazine *Scapegoat*. It isn't only the *Talmud* that contains unpleasant tracts. Ask Aleister Crowley! Above that: a "cartoon" and text from the sick mind of Michael Hoffman, who, whether he realises it or not, is doing a great job for the ADL, (reproduced from a 1994 issue of the American magazine the *Skeptic*, Volume 3, Number 1). Also included is Hoffman's letter to the editor. Above these: another of Hoffman's "cartoons".

Notes And References

- (1) In *CANDOUR: The British Views-Letter*, Vol. XXI, No. 503, September, 1970, page 180 under the title *THIS MAN IS DANGEROUS*. This was a review of Mullins' *New History of the Jews*, and an exposé of his hatemongering.
- (2) For the benefit of the totally uninitiated, Arthur Keith Chesterton, who died in 1973, was the founder of both the National Front and the League of Empire Loyalists. A former Fascist and editor of the BUF's *Blackshirt*, he fought in both World Wars. In 1948 he published a book on anti-Semitism in collaboration with the Orthodox Jewish writer Joseph Leftwich.
- (3) Like the revelations at the first Zundel trial, this piece of "respectable" Holocaust Revisionism was revealed to the world with no fanfare, in 1991, see for example the *Daily Mail*, March 3, 1993, page 10.
- (4) Because this leaflet folds in three places it doesn't read as photocopied here. Follow the handwritten "H" numbers at the top.
- (5) *A "Goy" Pries Into The "Talmud": The Six Million Reconsidered By The Light Of Four Small Candles* by Alexander Baron in collaboration with Rabbi Cohen comprising an investigation into Talmudic forgeries and an examination of the true nature of the Torah, published by InfoText Manuscripts, London, (1992). This is a 59 page (poorly typeset, photocopied) A4 pamphlet.
- (6) Yes, I am in love with that wonderful phrase!
- (7) Rabbi Yosef Goldstein, PR man for the Neturei Karta in Britain. Of whom much more anon.
- (8) *RABBI JOSEPH SOLOVEITCHIK*, London Times obituary, April 21, 1993, page 17.
- (9) *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*, Editor-in-Chief Geoffrey Wigoder, published by Facts On File, New York, (1992), page 878.
- (10) The Soncino *Talmud* may be authoritative, but a curious anomaly is that the word God is spelt thus throughout. To the Orthodox, that name is too holy to be spelt in full, hence it is usually rendered G-d. Even then one must be careful, for example, one must not write the holy name on a piece of paper and then throw it away.
- (11) Consider the word bitch. This means literally a female dog. On the other hand, if used to refer to a woman - your wife, say, it may take on a pejorative meaning, but even then not necessarily. Consider the following: "I can't understand why I ever married a hard-hearted bitch like you, Rebecca." But also "Rachel, you're like a bitch in heat tonight." Or "That Salome is one hell of a sexy bitch." Obviously so much depends on the context of the word (or epithet) used.
- (12) See the entry for *GENTILES* in the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 5, page 533-4.
- (13) (Ibid). Possibly along the lines of the well-known mother-in-law jokes, of the comedian the late Les Dawson, for example.
- (14) Ibid.
- (15) See entry under *HEATHENS*, Volume 5, page 269.
- (16) Also referred to by the acronym *akkum*.
- (17) *ZIONISM IN THE AGE OF THE DICTATORS: A reappraisal*, by Lenni Brenner, published by Croom Helm, Beckenham, Kent, (1983), page 23.
- (18) *A "Goy" Pries Into The "Talmud"...*, Baron and Cohen, (op cit), page 31. Needless to say, the Rabbi didn't put it quite like that.
- (19) I've actually lost count of the number of times I've found money in the street. I remember this incident very well though because I found it on the footbridge over Penge East station on the thirteenth of the month, a Friday if I remember correctly. A short time later I was talking with a workmate about superstition and one of us joked that this proved that thirteen was indeed unlucky. For the person who'd dropped the note! (20) And of course I would have handed the money in if I could have identified the owner, honest.
- (21) Assuming he (or she) did, it would, paradoxically, cost a lot more money to return it to its owner than a mere ten pounds. I was once told by a British Library staff member that it cost £7 merely to issue a receipt in that organisation!
- (22) In 1979, Maurice Ludmer, the founder and editor of *Searchlight* who died in 1981, published a pamphlet called *Women And The National Front* in which he made the none too subtle point that there are six million reasons white women should not have white babies. This pamphlet was actually published under the name of a shiksah (and *shabbos goy*) named Veronica (or V'ron) Ware. Ware took over as editor on Ludmer's death, and later went on to write a book about the evils of being both a woman and white. Notwithstanding the well-documented

obsession of a certain type of racial Jew for pushing miscegenation, this is not entirely a Jewish pastime, and is in any case something which the *Talmud* frowns on.

(23) This case made headlines all around the world; Robert Thompson and Jon Venables became the two youngest convicted murderers in Britain this century.

(24) In April 1947, a nine year old boy was charged with the murder of four year old Glyndwr Owen Charles Parfitt; the alleged murder took place in Nant-y-Bar, Cymmer, Glamorgan. I came across this case entirely by accident, but although it was reported in the national press at this stage, I could find no reference to a trial. When cautioned by the police, the boy is alleged to have said: "I won't do it again." He was committed for trial at the end of April; it seems most unlikely that he was convicted of murder, though he may have been convicted of a lesser charge, acquitted, or even found unfit to plead. A letter of enquiry to the court authority concerned went unanswered.

(25) I saw a TV documentary on this recently. The details elude me but there was mention of a woman - in either Egypt or Bangladesh - who had been raped and was then expected to marry her rapist.

(26) Especially when, as she told me later, the Jews - meaning the Rabbi as well - are flooding the media with "all that pornography" !!!

(27) *Hagigah* is not a book; I could find no reference in the *Talmud* index to 27a, page 171, as cited by Hoffman. However, the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (Volume 5, page 164) reports that it covers designation of sacrifices at the festivals.

(28) *Gittin* means divorce, but covers other things besides.

(29) This was a poem about a necrophiliac Roman soldier apparently describing performing sexual acts on the body of the dead Christ.

(30) The Midianites were an ancient people who inhabited Midian in Northwestern Arabia. Sadly, I never get invited to sin with anyone's daughter.

(31) Sorry Rabbi, I meant G-d.

(32) Obviously this idiot didn't realise that God, being omnipotent, can do anything he likes. You's goin' t'Hell, boy, whether you likes it or not.

(33) A "Goy" Pries Into The "Talmud"..., Baron and Cohen, page 29, (op cit).

(34) *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 6, pages 86-7. And frankly, my dear, I couldn't give a damn.

(35) The entry for JESUS OF NAZARETH in the *UJE*, Volume 6, actually runs from pages 83-7. Pages 86-7 cover *The Jewish Attitude Toward Jesus*.

(36) I'm not entirely sure that *Aryan* includes the current writer, although *goy* certainly does, whatever those wicked people down at Uckfield may have told you.

(37) The entry for *GEHINNOM* can be found in Volume 4, pages 520-1.

(38) Hoffman uses the word mile instead of *mil*, whatever a *mil* may be.

(39) He said too that a traditional - though not necessarily Jewish - cure for jaundice is to place a pigeon on the sufferer's stomach. I doubt very much a stomach covered with pigeon guano will cure jaundice anymore than a dose of dog shit will cure pleurisy, but I'd have far fewer reservations about trying it out.

(40) Grimstad is a one-time managing editor of the American Nazi newspaper *White Power*. He registered as a Saudi agent in 1978. See *Saudi 'agent' repudiated*, by Clifford Chanin, published in the *Jewish Chronicle*, June 2, 1978, page 5.

(41) According to Volume 3 of the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, in particular the entry for *CANARDS*, "Tob shebe goyyim harog" is actually a command to kill the best of the Gentiles "in time of war". Note the difference!

(42) Hoffman renders the name Baruch, but transliterations of Hebrew words vary widely.

(43) Originally it was claimed that up to fifty people had been killed. Hoffman's leaflet reports forty dead.

(44) Ie Hoffman.

(45) Rabbi Yaacov Perrin, he of "One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail" fame.

(46) *The Times*, September 21 1982, page 6.

(47) This cartoon, which was extremely mild and more anti-American than anti-Zionist, was published in the short lived unofficial Labour Party newspaper *Labour Herald* on January 7, 1983.

(48) The "Jewish events magazine" *New Moon*, May 1992, page 19, revealed that Gable has never been a member of a synagogue.

(49) The film is based on Keneally's book which was called originally *Schindler's Ark*.

(50) The 35 volumes of the Soncino *Talmud* take up over five feet of shelf space. As the *Talmud* covers every conceivable aspect of human behaviour, and as the *Torah* - the body of Jewish law - is being constantly updated, it would be inconceivable for it not to contain a certain number of unpleasant passages, but as the cartoon at the bottom of page 20 illustrates, this is hardly unique to Judaism.

A CASE STUDY IN TALMUDIC CALUMNY AND TWISTED LOGIC

(51) *ISRAEL and the NEW WORLD ORDER*, by Andrew J. Hurley, published by Fithian Press/Foundation for a New World Order, Santa Barbara, (1991). See in particular pages 193-200. Some Zionist rabbis liken the Arabs to Amalek, whom the Israelites are ordered to destroy utterly.

(52) The same cannot of course be said for the likes of Gerry Gable, who is a conscious manipulator of the media and the gullible *goyim* of the misnamed anti-fascist movement, and therefore an evil little bastard in his own right.

(53) To the real Jews, TV is an abomination, and the cinema is cut from the same cloth. As long ago as December 1955, Hoffman's fellow traveller Arnold Leese reported in his anti-Jewish hate sheet *Gothic Ripples* (22nd December, 1955, issue 134, page 3) that "A poster signed by 150 rabbis in Britain, America and Canada has appeared on synagogue notice-boards condemning Television as 'a parade of depravity.' They did not say that it was a Jewish parade of depravity for Gentiles."

Leese too missed the point: the Jews who control the media, who spew out anti-German and anti-Aryan hate propaganda, are not the same Jews who devote their lives to the study of the *Torah*; the former are not in fact Jews at all in any meaningful sense.

(54) This was reported with much glee in *Revisionist Researcher*, Volume 4, Number 8.

(55) My suggestion.

(56) For an example of condemnation by a secular Jew, the reader is referred to Lucien Wolf's article *The Zionist Peril*, which was published in the October 1904 issue of *The Jewish Quarterly Review*.

(57) *Jews Against Zionism: The American Council for Judaism, 1942-1948*, by Thomas A. Kolsky, published by Temple University Press, Philadelphia, (1990), page 17. Incidentally, it was at the 1897 Congress that Herzl "the Prince of the Exile" is supposed to have read the *Protocols*. I've no doubt Hoffman believes in the *Protocols*; it is obvious from his comments on *The Jew, the Gypsy and El Islam* in his letter of September 12, 1994, that he believes Jews practice ritual murder.

(58) See Kolsky, *Jews Against Zionism*, (ibid). This is an excellent monograph on the American Council for Judaism.

(59) Zionism did exist before Herzl, but the Chovevei Zion and others were not Zionists in the proper sense of the word.

(60) I have used the same analogy in more or less the same words in the study I wrote in collaboration with Rabbi Goldstein, *THE WORLD ZIONIST CONSPIRACY Exposed By A Rabbi*, published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing, London, (January 1995).

(61) Needless to say, skepticism goes out of the window whenever the Holocaust is debated. Except when it comes to taking pot shots at the Revisionists, of course.

(62) Although he had been suspected for some time, particularly by the then leader of the British Movement, Michael McLaughlin, Hill's treachery was not revealed to the world until March 1984 when he "came out" in an article in the *News Of The World*. Hill's mythical exploits in the Nazi underworld were subsequently made into a lie-ridden pseudo-documentary and an even more lie-ridden book, both called *The Other Face Of Terror*. The current writer's painstakingly researched and irrefutably documented 1994 biography of Hill exposes the film, the book and the man himself as worthless trash.

In October 1936, nearly half a century before Hill "came out", Sir Oswald Mosley wrote in the *Blackshirt*: "Some do this in perfect good faith and honesty, and thus unconsciously help the enemies of their cause. Others, no doubt, as the struggle develops, will actually be employed, often unknowingly, by those very clever people, the big Jews, to make wild and foolish attacks upon Jews in general, in order to discredit anti-Semitism." While in our own time, Louis R. Beam, wrote in the Spring 1991, issue of *The Seditionist* that: "The Zionist Occupational Government of America requires willing morons to serve them. ZOG is looking for a few bad men. Are you bad enough? Then see your local nigger hater and sign up. Or if nigger hating is not your forte, your local loud mouth, foul speaking Jew hater. Applicants must be willing to commit senseless acts of vandalism, while occasionally harming innocents who have no idea why they are being brutalized. Must be accustomed to engaging in meaningless pursuits, which have no chance of success. No education or previous experience at anything required. Prefer non-thinkers. For more information dial 1-800-FBI-ADL."

(63) For the record, having studied this subject in considerable depth, I am convinced of the authenticity of *The Diary Of Anne Frank*, which, although it has certainly been edited, is just about the only genuine document ever to have come out of the Holocaust.

Published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing

Distributed by InfoText Manuscripts,
93c Venner Road,
Sydenham,
London SE26 5HU.
England.

ISBN 1 898318 52 2

Copyright Alexander Baron, 1995.